

**KELLEY****DRYE****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 24 2007****FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

**TO**  
**FIRM** USPTO  
**CITY**  
**FAX** 571-273-8300  
**PHONE**  
**NO. OF PAGES** 3 (including this page)  
**DATE** August 24, 2007

**KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP**  
333 WEST WACKER DRIVE  
SUITE 2800  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606  
(312) 857-7070  
FAX (312) 857-7085

**MESSAGE:** Please see attached.

**FROM** Harold Wells  
**PHONE** (312) 857-2336  
**E-MAIL** hwells@kelleydrye.com  
**TIMEKEEPER ID** 05372  
**CLIENT NO.** 017191.0003

**NEW YORK, NY**  
**WASHINGTON, DC**  
**TYSONS CORNER, VA**  
**CHICAGO, IL**  
**STAMFORD, CT**  
**PARSIPPANY, NJ**  
**BRUSSELS**

**AFFILIATE OFFICES**  
**JAKARTA**  
**MUMBAI**

**IF PROBLEMS OCCUR DURING TRANSMISSION PLEASE CALL (312) 857-7070.**

The information contained in this facsimile message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, copying, disclosure or dissemination of this communication may be subject to legal restriction or sanction.

CH01/WEL/HJA/222577.1

AUG 24 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re: U.S. Patent Application	) Customer No. 47670
	)
Applicant: Michael J. Pugia et al.	) Attorney Docket: 017191.0003
	)
Serial No.: 10/082,415	) Confirmation No.: 8582
	)
Filed: February 26, 2002	)
	)
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR	)
PRECISE TRANSFER AND	)
MANIPULATION OF FLUIDS BY	)
CENTRIFUGAL AND/OR CAPILLARY	)
FORCES	)
	)
Examiner: Samuel P. Siefke	)
	)
Art Unit: 1743	)

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In his advisory action of August 9, 2007, Examiner Siefke stated "The amendment to the claims, specifically the addition of defining the sample passageway between two vents raises new issues that would require further consideration." This is substantially the same reason given in the Examiner's advisory action of June 9, 2006. The Applicants request reconsideration because the proposed amendment merely clarified what was intended in the previous amendment. Thus, the latest amendments should have been entered, since they clearly distinguish the Shartle reference.

In the amendment filed January 22, 2007, claims 1 and 38 were amended to state that a segment defining a uniform volume of a liquid sample was disposed between two vents. The transfer passageway would transfer the uniform volume of liquid sample "through an entrance to said segment between said vents to a first reagent well." This amendment was intended to distinguish the Shartle reference, as confirmed by the following statement (see p. 10, right

CH01/WELL.HA/22520.1